

REMARKS

The Examiner indicated that claims 12 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and Applicant has implemented the Examiner's suggestion with the above amendments that rewrite claims 12 and 21 in independent form. Claims 9 and 13-15 depend from claim 12, and claims 17, 20 and 23 depend from claim 21. All of these claims are allowable in view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Applicant has added new claims 24-41 with the above amendments. Claims 24-32 are allowable over the references previously cited by the Examiner because none of the references teach or suggest a method for inspecting parts in carrier tape, wherein the carrier tape is vibrated to reposition a part rejected in a first inspection so that the rejected part can be re-inspected to determine whether the part was falsely rejected in the first inspection. Claims 33-37 are allowable over the references previously cited by the Examiner because none of the references teach or suggest a method of inspecting parts in carrier tape, wherein the part is inspected a first time, the carrier tape is vibrated to move the part in the carrier tape pocket, then the part is inspected a second time, and then a second part is inspected. Claims 38-41 are allowable over the references previously cited by the Examiner because none of the references teach or suggest a method of inspecting parts in carrier tape, wherein a part is positioned in a pocket of the carrier tape, the carrier tape is vibrated a first time, then part is inspected, then the carrier tape is vibrated a second time, and the part is reinspected in the pocket of the carrier tape after the second vibration.

The references previously relied upon by the Examiner relate to settling nails and powder in containers with the assistance of a vibration system. Those references do not contemplate inspection and/or false rejections. Those references are only concerned with settling the material within its container, not moving the material for re-inspection, repositioning the material for re-inspection to determine whether there was a false rejection, or vibrating the material before and after an inspection. Those references provide no teaching or suggestion that, once the commodity is settled within the container, it may be desirable to vibrate the module to reposition the commodity for further inspection.

The invention recited in the claims is one that, to the best knowledge of the Applicant, has never before been used in the inspection of parts in carrier tape. Prior to the present invention, there was no way to weed out false rejections that were based on the position of the

part in the carrier tape. Consequently, users had to accept the losses associated with false rejections, and good parts were frequently scrapped.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 9, 12-15, 17, 20-21, and 23-41 are respectfully requested. Please note that the attorney docket number for the present application has been changed to 048645-9008-01. Kindly update the Office's records to reflect this change.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel S. Jones". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Daniel" and last name "Jones" clearly legible.

Daniel S. Jones
Reg. No. 42,697

Docket No. 048645-9008-01
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108

(414) 271-6560